

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 15 and 16 are amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claim is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 15 was objected to because of informalities. In paragraph 15 on page 7 of the Office Action, the Office Action stated that claim 15 is a duplicate of claim 16. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection, but in the interest of prosecution have amended claims 15 and 16 to clarify the invention. It is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 16 are now proper and in condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicants' respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the objection.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

In paragraph 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Azarmi et al. (US 5,905,715) in view of Calabrese et al. (US 6,236,857). In paragraph 12 on page 6 of the Office Action, dependent claims 18 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Azarmi et al. in view of Sigler et al. (US 6,447,370).

According to the Office Action, Azarmi discloses Applicants' invention substantially as claimed. However, according to the Office Action, Azarmi fails to disclose that the local service activation management system is configured to provide local telephone service and to provide telecommunications services outside of a service area that is local to the customers. Nevertheless, according to the Office Action, Calabrese discloses a telephonic network, which provides local telephone service and telecommunications services outside of a service area.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Applicants' submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention.

As admitted by the Office Action, Azarmi fails to provide a local service activation management system (LSAM) that is configured to enable a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers. Rather, Azarmi discloses a network management system for one or more workstations (col. 6, lines 58-61). The management system can be used in networks having network intelligence provided away from a switch. (col. 3, lines 31-38). In

Azarmi, the management system is configured to enabled a response to a trigger signal, such as a network fault related indicator, to output an appropriate performance or fault report. (claims 15, 20, 21; col. 2, lines 60-61). Thus, the Azarmi device does not provide any component that enables a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers as required by Applicants' independent claims.

Calabrese fails to remedy the deficiencies of Azarmi as Calabrese fails to provide at least a local service activation management system that is configured to enable a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers. Calabrese merely describes enabling a mobile switching center (MSC) to provide wireless services to a mobile station in a public switched telephone network (PSTN). Thus, the Calabrese device does not provide any component that enables a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers as required by Applicants' independent claims. Sigler fails to remedy the deficiencies of Azarmi and Calabrese as Sigler fails to provide at least a local service activation management system that is configured to enable a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers.

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicants' independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 are patentable over the cited references.

Because claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-19, which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively, include the features recited in the independent claims as well as additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-19 are also patentably distinct over the cited references. Nevertheless, Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the Examiner's rejection with respect to such dependent claims and reserves the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-20) are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed

invention is patentably distinct. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Applicants respectfully request that if Examiner does not agree with Applicants arguments, the Examiner specifically recite what component of the cited reference(s) (and where it is recited) is configured to enable a core telecommunication system to provide local telephone service to customers. This will allow Applicants to have a clear understanding of Examiner's rejections for drafting a possible appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 4, 2003



Thomas J. Strouse
Reg. No. 53,950